

## REMARKS

Claims 1-8, are currently pending in the present application. As indicated above, Claims 1 and 4 have been amended, and Claims 9-18 have been cancelled without prejudice.

In the Office Action, the Examiner has rejected Claims 1-18 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by *Xu et al.* (U.S. 6,738,362). Additionally, the Examiner has objected to the drawings.

With regard to the Examiner's objection to the drawings, the Examiner asserts that FIGs. 1-3 should be labeled as "Prior Art". Accordingly, replacement FIGs. 1-3 are enclosed herewith, which include the legend -- PRIOR ART --. Therefore, it is respectfully requested that the objection to the drawings be withdrawn.

With regard to the rejections of Claims 9-18, as indicated above, these claims have been cancelled without prejudice. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection of these claims is moot.

With regard to independent Claims 1 and 4, as indicated above, these claims have been amended, and it is respectfully submitted that these claims are patentably distinct from *Xu*.

More specifically, in the present invention, an HA stores the VPN service desired by a MN when initially storing a location information. However, referring to col. 6 and Fig. 2A of *Xu*, a home registration agent (18A) performs only a location registration of a mobile node by receiving location registration request message from an FA. That is, *Xu* does not disclose storing the VPN service desired by MN, as recited in Claims 1 and 4.

Additionally, Claims 1 and 4 recite an ISP server for tunneling between networks of an FA and an ISP to communicate between VPNs operated by a mobile network and ISP. However, a home tunneling agent (18B) of *Xu* receives traffic of a mobile node through an FA in order to transmit the

traffic to the destination. That is, a home tunneling agent (18B) of *Xu* does not use a tunnel that is made when it is needed, for example, for tunneling, but simply transmits data through a tunnel already made. Therefore, based on these arguments, it is respectfully submitted that amended independent Claims 1 and 4 are patentably distinct from *Xu*, and it is respectfully requested that the rejection of these claims be withdrawn.

Additionally, dependent Claims 2-3 and 5-8, which depend from Claims 1 and 4, respectively, are also believed to be in condition for allowance, at least due to their dependencies.

Accordingly, all of the claims pending in the Application, namely, Claims 1-8, are believed to be in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference or personal interview would facilitate resolution of any remaining matters, the Examiner may contact Applicant's attorney at the number given below.

Respectfully submitted

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'D. Owens III', with a stylized flourish at the end.

Douglas M. Owens III  
Reg. No. 51,314  
Attorney for Applicant

DILWORTH & BARRESE LLP  
333 Earle Ovington Blvd.  
Uniondale, New York 11553  
Tel: (516) 228-8484  
Fax: (516) 228-8516  
DMO/las